

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 28-33 are pending in this application. Claims 22-27 are currently cancelled. Claims 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 19 are amended herein. Claims 28-33 have been added herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 22-27 have been canceled here as being directed to an unelected invention. Applicants may file a divisional application at a later date.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 11-16, 18, 20 and 21.

Claims 1-10, 17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 refers to a structure having a greater mechanical load-bearing capacity, which the Office Action asserts is not supported by the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that structures with a greater height are not the only examples of structures with greater mechanical load-bearing capacity. As but one example, Applicant respectfully refers to Figures 5a and 5b, and corresponding Paragraph [0039], which provide an example of a supporting ring 10. See e.g., Claim 7. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1, as originally filed, particularly points out and distinctly claims the invention.

Claims 3 and 17 recite that the selected 3-D structures have a lower degree of compressibility than the functional 3-D structures. As but one example, the supporting ring 10 can cause a lower degree of compressibility. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 17, as originally filed, particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Claims 5 and 19, as amended, recite that the selected 3-D structures include a compliant base material that has a greater volume than the compliant base element of the functional 3-D structures. This feature is clearly illustrated, albeit in two dimensions, in Figure 6, where structure 1 clearly has a greater volume than structure 8. *See also* Par. [0036]. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 19, as amended herein, particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. It is further noted for the record that the amendment of these claims has broadened, rather than limited, the scope of the claims (i.e., now the volume need only be greater rather than significantly greater).

Claim 10 recites that the selected 3-D structures are able to be electrically bonded. The Office Action states that since the structures are only for mechanical purposes it is not clear what they can be electrically bonded to. Applicant respectfully submits that these questions are not germane to the question of whether the claim is vague or indefinite. The specification clearly teaches at least one embodiment, see e.g., Figure 4a, where the structure is covered with the same material as the bondable structures 8 (see e.g., Figure 7). It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 10, as originally filed, particularly points out and distinctly claims the invention.

Finally the specification has been objected to because of a number of informalities. The Office Action notes that Paragraph [0036] refers to the EPR1 as structured such that the upper surface is free and a cap-like structure is produced. The Office Action then questions whether this is inconsistent. Referring to Paragraph [0037], in step c, layer(s) 6/5 are formed wherever the resists EPR1 (coated in step b) is not.

With respect to the questions relating to Figures 5A and 5B, these figures are clearly discussed in Paragraph [0039]. The first line of Paragraph [0039] clearly identifies metallic supporting ring 10. Finally, Paragraph [0036] clearly identifies bond pad 11 (see line 7).

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance.

However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

6/14/05

---

Date



---

Ira S. Matsil  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 35,272

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793  
Tel. 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218